

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 1

BOSTON GLOBE
1 DECEMBER 1978

CIA chief: Not all at Harvard tell of ties

By Al Larkin
Globe Staff

Central Intelligence Agency Director Stanisfield Turner said yesterday that certain Harvard professors are ignoring university guidelines by refusing to reveal their relationship with the CIA.

Turner did not identify the professors or say how many are involved or what services they provide, but said they have chosen not to honor a university request that certain relationships with the CIA be reported to the university administration.

Turner said that while he "reminds prospective CIA candidates of the guidelines, 'if that individual elects not to (comply) because he may think it's an infringement of his right of association, I'm not about to force him...'"

The remarks came during an hour-long interview at The Boston Globe during which Turner defended the agency's use of academics in intelligence work and suggested that it ought to be expanded rather than further regulated.

And, although he plans to have breakfast with Harvard President Derek C. Bok this morning, Turner's comments indicated that the differences between the two men have continued to simmer since the guidelines were released in May 1977.

Daniel Steiner, Harvard's general counsel, said yesterday that the guidelines don't prohibit consulting relationships with the CIA, and he wasn't sure it was those relationships to which Turner referred.

But, even in consultant relationships, the Harvard guidelines do recommend that "the individual should report in writing the existence of such an arrangement" to the dean who would then report the matter to Bok.

Turner said that "a suggestion has been made that I should not deal with

academics out there unless they do that. In short, that I should insure compliance with Bok's rule. My position is that his rule applies to Harvard and not to me."

Steiner agreed that it was not Turner's responsibility to enforce the guidelines. But he said he hoped that most professors would comply with the guidelines, although they are voluntary, "for the university's sake and for their own protection."

Steiner explained that while Harvard "sees nothing wrong," with consulting relationships, he believed that prior disclosure of them would protect the individual professor from unwarranted criticism if the relationship was revealed later elsewhere.

But Turner specifically objected to the Harvard guidelines because they single out only CIA contracts for disclosure. Some other schools, Turner said, require disclosure of all outside contracts.

"That I don't object to at all," he said. "But here, this close to Salem, Massachusetts, we have an example where you're isolating a particular segment of American society and saying we are pariahs and an association with us is different than anybody else and I think that's dangerous."

Steiner called Turner's claim that a relationship with the CIA is the same as a relationship with a business or law firm "a false analogy," and said that Harvard acted as a result of CIA abuses on American campuses.

"It was the CIA that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence said was engaging in improper activities on U.S. campuses and it was the committee that suggested that universities look and see if guidelines were needed," Steiner said.

In fact, Harvard's primary concern in drawing up the guidelines was to prevent any covert presence of the CIA on campus, especially in the area of recruiting, where professors were sometimes asked to submit the names of foreign students as potential contacts.

But Turner, while not detailing just how such recruiting is now handled, said that "there's nothing in the laws of this land that say we couldn't recruit foreigners in the United States to work for us overseas."

Turner's insistence on having the right to use academics, even in instances where universities have tried to discourage it, reflects the agency's continuing reliance upon the human element in intelligence gathering.

Although the CIA has begun to rely more and more on technological surveillance and intelligence techniques — methods that appear to work well in military and economic areas — human contacts have proved more reli-

CONTINUED